

September 20, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 12251

Current hearings by this committee, designed primarily to permit industry representatives to be heard will develop the fact that they have already expressed themselves in substantial accord with the proposals contained in the Administration bill as represented by S. 1985, my bill H.R. 11142 and H.R. 11197.

Mr. Williams assures me that this is so, and further that the Association which he represents also supports the proposed legislation. He has been in constant contact in recent months with many members of the insurance industry who have expressed their willingness to cooperate to their fullest capability upon activation of the program.

In July 1967 a major grouping of private insurance companies met to consider how they will participate in the event of passage of the proposed legislation. These companies would provide the capital to backstop private participation in the joint program. Other companies, many of them independent insurers, would sell and service flood insurance policies and perform administrative duties associated with the program.

I therefore urge prompt favorable action on this measure.

#### CONGRESS DALLIES: HURRICANE MAY BEAT FLOOD INSURANCE

"All we really need is one big storm and you'll see some action by Congress."

An insurance industry spokesman was talking about the flood insurance program pending in Washington most of 1967.

At the rate of movement, hurricane Beulah may make it to land ahead of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Rep. Claude Pepper sponsored a bill to establish a federally supported program protecting home and business owners in flood-prone areas of this nation. The bill has languished in a House subcommittee since early summer and Washington sources indicate the earliest possible moment for another hearing date is a week from tomorrow.

A similar bill, introduced by Sen. Harrison Williams of New Jersey, may actually pass the Senate this afternoon.

Flood damages, as every home owner knows, are not compensated for by insurance. We all recall hurricane Donna in 1960 which wreaked such havoc in both Miami and the Florida Keys, with its high waters. Hurricane Betsy, two years ago, ravaged New Orleans and much of the Mississippi delta, causing damage conservatively estimated at \$1 billion, the most expensive single disaster in the history of American insurance.

Flood insurance has had a soggy path in Congress, going back to 1956 when it was first proposed. Congress authorized a reinsurance and loan program for insurers and flood victims alike that year but then refused to appropriate any money to get the program underway.

Because of hurricane Betsy, the insurance industry has been reluctant to insure homes and businesses against flood losses. From the insurers' point of view, the huge claims they might have to pay are not balanced against low possibility of occurrence.

Representative Pepper's bill proposes a joint plan in which the federal government backstops participating private companies by helping them pay huge policy claims and in turn, would also help residents of high risk areas pay proportionately larger premiums.

The course of hurricane Beulah still is unpredictable today, but not half as much as the course of Congress.

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GALLAGHER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### LITTLE AND LATE—BUT NEEDED

(Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years many of us in Congress have urged the development of an antiballistic missile system in the United States. It has long been known that the Soviets are constructing such a system and it has been our concern that we in the United States were tolerating a serious weakness in our own defense posture by failing to offset this with a system of our own. Secretary of Defense McNamara has argued that costs were so great—as much as \$30 billion—that it would be better to depend upon a massive strike capability against the Soviets.

To me, there is weakness in this reasoning in that the United States is committed to a "no first strike" policy. This would permit the Russians to get off the first nuclear strike, an action which could kill as many as 90 million Americans. The havoc created by such a strike could possibly destroy this country's capability for effective retaliation, and this the Russians well know. Regardless of this fact, it has never appeared acceptable to me to consider \$30 billion more important than 90 million American lives. After all, we are now spending that much each year in Vietnam to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. We can spend as much to insure the life and security of America and its people. Actually, the cost of an ABM system would be prorated over approximately 5 years, thus creating a considerably smaller burden than the cost of the Vietnamese war.

The administration has hoped through negotiation to achieve an agreement that the Russians would cease the development of their ABM system. This has not been possible. Now the Red Chinese have entered the picture with an unpredictably rapid development of their own nuclear weapon capability. In less than 3 years, Red China has become a thermonuclear power and conceivably they will have an ICBM capability even before we can develop a defense against this new threat.

It would be foolhardy to continue to assume that fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors. The belligerency of the Red Chinese is too well known to require comment. They will blackmail their neighbors into compliance with their demands whenever their military power and their internal situation permits them to do so. When they are capable of launching a nuclear attack upon the United States, our position of world leadership will be doubly jeopardized if we

have no defense against such an attack. Even more ominous is the risk to our country and its people.

It has not been brought out previously but this country may face the threat of a double attack from the two great Communist powers. There is no assurance whatever that the breach between Red China and the Soviet Union will not be healed in the event of a massive confrontation with the democratic world. The risk obviously is unacceptable.

Development of an ABM system is, of course, expensive but now doubly necessary. We simply have no choice. The security of our country must be our first consideration and must receive the highest national priority. America and its people have too much to lose to ignore the challenge which is presented. The question then is whether we are proceeding rapidly enough toward the development of our defenses. The system which has been approved is the so-called thin China-oriented ABM system which will require an expenditure of \$5 billion over the next 5 years.

The system which will be built does not measure up to the need for a fully effective ABM system. It is little and late—but needed. Not too little and too late—but not enough. I would hope that the President would recognize the necessity for taking every possible step to insure America's security in the years ahead. For years we led in the development of nuclear weapons. That is no longer true and it becomes more and more essential that we now take any steps at our command to discourage and deter nuclear attacks which the lack of an ABM system could prompt. We have an Achilles heel which offers a tempting target and which is too dangerous to tolerate further. I urge in strongest terms that there will be an immediate expansion of the planned ABM system to insure fullest possible protection and that its long-delayed construction be launched immediately.

#### CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES EARLY ENACTMENT OF NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER LEGISLATION

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1967, it was my pleasure to appear before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House Public Works Committee to testify in support of legislation providing a Visitor Center for the Nation's Capital.

Today an editorial appeared in the Washington Post urging that a National Visitor Center be completed and operating prior to the bicentennial celebration of our Nation's birth in 1976. I heartily concur in this idea, for the Capital of the United States has long been in need of organized assistance for the millions of visitors who come here each year from every State in the Union and from many countries all over the world.

What better way is there to welcome these visitors to the Nation's Capital than by providing a Visitor Center where they

can leave their cars, collect information, receive assistance from guides, and begin their tour under pleasant circumstances and surroundings?

Hon. KEN GRAY, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has introduced H.R. 12603 to provide for a National Visitor Center and his subcommittee has already held 2 days of hearings on this proposal. I have joined Congressman GRAY by introducing H.R. 12770, which is identical to H.R. 12603, and I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

The editorial follows:

#### ON WITH THE VISITOR CENTER

The final report of the National Visitor Center Study Commission causes wonder as to how the city has ever gotten along without the facilities now contemplated. The blunt truth is, of course, that it has not gotten along very well. Hordes of visitors who have a direct, personal interest in their National Capital have been left to drift in confusion. Usually unable to park anywhere near the buildings and historic shrines they want to see, many leave without really attaining the purpose of their visit. Meanwhile the city has been unnecessarily congested by the automobiles of drivers who are not sure where they wish to go.

The transformation of Union Station into a Visitors Center from which tours will be conducted to all points of scenic and historic interest is an ideal solution of the problem. It will provide in one commodious center not only parking space and all varieties of tourist information, but also orientation films, the film diorama, exhibits, a nursery, a hotel reservation center, a tour desk and even an infirmary and "short-stay" hotel. Beneath the parking ramps at the rear of the present building a modern railroad station will also be built.

The Center will go a long way toward making Washington the most desirable city in America to visit. As the Nation's Capital, it should occupy this position, but in the past it has done far too little to welcome its visitors and enable them to see the city with comfort and understanding. Now that an admirable plan has been devised to correct this long-standing deficiency we hope that it will move promptly to fulfillment. It is especially desirable to have the new center in operation well in advance of the country's celebration of its 200th birthday in 1976.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON WELCOMES THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY IN A NEW DEMONSTRATION OF HARMONY BETWEEN TWO FREE AND INDEPENDENT NATIONS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson received the President of Italy on his current official visit with the warmth, dignity, and respect that all Americans feel for the people and the Republic of Italy.

In his greetings, President Johnson enumerated the long and close ties which have joined Italy and America for hundreds of years.

The joint communique issued after their talks was another illustration of the identity of views between our two countries on all basic issues—war and peace, economic development, stability in Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

The visit of President Saragat is also another illustration of a wider Johnson initiative—the initiative of person-to-person diplomacy. The initiative of sitting down face to face with the leader of another free nation and discussing frankly and openly the issues which unite and, perhaps, divide us.

This is the kind of frank personal diplomacy the Nation has now come to associate with President Johnson.

A dramatic demonstration of personal diplomacy was the summit meeting at Glassboro in which the President and Premier Kosygin discussed their problems and hopes, face to face for long hours at a time—and indeed the world was a little safer when that meeting concluded.

But President Johnson does not give this kind of personal attention only to large or powerful nations. He devotes his full attention to the leaders of every nation officially visiting the United States. In the last year alone there have been dozens of officials and unofficial visits to the White House by leaders of sovereign nations. Each visitor was treated with respect and cordiality. Each visitor knew that Lyndon Johnson was personally interested in his nation and the progress of his people.

The Republic of Italy and the United States have always been the closest of friends. The visit of President Saragat reinforced that friendship.

Our President has again shown us in foreign affairs or domestic affairs, personal interest, personal involvement, personal contact, can be as valuable as world conferences or world treaties or international commitments.

I believe that the nations of the world today look upon the United States with greater approval, more respect, and greater friendship and understanding than at any time in this century. And the reason they do so is because of the untiring and selfless efforts of President Johnson.

#### PROTECTING SAFETY

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in urging the enactment of firearms control legislation, the President, speaking last Thursday evening before the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Kansas City, stated that passage of gun legislation "would plug one more big loophole to save your life, or mine, or the life of some innocent child down the street."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, writing in the September 1 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, stated the question in simple terms. He said:

We have reached the point where the time for debate is past; the time for action is here.

I wholeheartedly agree with these sentiments. Delay can no longer be tolerated, as pointed out in an editorial entitled "Protecting Safety" from the Washington Post of September 16, 1967. I commend this article to each Member

of the House and include it as a part of my remarks at this point:

#### PROTECTING SAFETY

The President's hard-hitting message to Congress on gun control, immediately following his earthy, practical speeches on crime to the International Association of Police Chiefs on Thursday, points to an imperative need. "Last year," he told the Congress, "two million guns were sold in the United States. Many of them were sold to hardened criminals, snipers, mental defectives, rapists, habitual drunkards and juveniles. There is no excuse for this." There is no excuse at all. And no member of Congress who does not do all that he can to correct this condition has any moral right whatever to prate about crime in the streets, or organized crime or any other kind of crime than his own callous neglect of elementary public safety.

"Let's not be content to bewail the rising crime rate or to talk about the statistics or the numbers of repeaters who fill our jails and prisons," Mr. Johnson said of the police chiefs, "while we turn our backs and ignore the fact they can go to any mall order house and get a weapon to shoot your wife after they tear the door down at midnight." Talking to policemen about the moral idiosyncrasy of allowing guns to be sold to any thug or lunatic who may want them is talking about a matter of life and death of them. Of the 278 officers killed in this country since 1960, 96 per cent were killed with guns.

Quoting the FBI statistics, the President told Congress of a 24 per cent rise in the use of guns in aggravated assaults in the first six months of 1967. The President has every right to assert as he did to the Police Chiefs, that the long-pending legislation to limit out-of-state purchase and interstate mail order sale of firearms "is the most effective way that the Federal Government has of protecting your safety and the safety of your children from criminals and drug addicts and the mentally ill."

The President has every right, too, to decry "hand-wringing about crime in the streets" on the part of politicians who sabotaged his Safe Streets bill in the House and sidetracked it in the Senate. The local police all over the country are in desperate need of Federal help—in training, in equipment, in reorganization. "Self-righteous indignation," as the President said, "is not a policy. It is a substitute for a policy." America needs more weapons in the hands of law enforcers and fewer in the hands of lawbreakers.

#### ALTERNATIVE TO SURTAX

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, probably the most controversial measure now before Congress is the proposed 10-percent surtax on personal and corporate income. The administration claims a dual need for a surtax—to finance the war in Vietnam, and to combat inflation. However, a number of people remain unconvinced of the certainty of pervasive inflation and desire reduced Government expenditure in nondefense areas.

To my mind, the two points of the argument in support of a surtax do not belong together. For one thing, the 10-percent surtax will probably not cover the deficit. Even if enacted, it is estimated that wartime expenditures will exceed revenues by \$14 to \$18 billion. While the surtax would undoubtedly